arXiv:1611.00508v1 [math.DS] 2 Nov 2016

Co–existence of maximal and whiskered tori for the planetary three–body problem, with the outer planet in retrograde motion*

Gabriella Pinzari†

Dipartimento di Matematica ed Applicazioni "R. Caccioppoli'
Università di Napoli "Federico II"
Monte Sant'Angelo – Via Cinthia I-80126 Napoli (Italy)
gabriella.pinzari@unina.it

November 3, 2016

Abstract

Using two different systems of canonical coordinates for the planetary problem, we prove coexistence of maximal and whiskered tori in a region of phase space of the three–body problem.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Maximal tori **5**

3 Whiskered tori **9**
3.1 The reduction of perihelia 9
3.2 A domain of regularity including (↑↓) 11
3.3 Bifurcations to instability in the secular problem 12
3.4 Three–dimensional whiskered tori 14

4 Co–existence of tori **18**

A Appendix to Section 2 **23**
A.1 The Jacobi–Radau–Deprit coordinates 23
A.2 The outer retrograde configuration: regularization, second–order expansion, full torsion 23

B Appendix to Section 3 **26**

C Appendix to Section 4 **27**

References **28**

*MSC2000 numbers: primary: 34C20, 70F10, 37J10, 37J15, 37J40; secondary: 34D10, 70F07, 70F15, 37J25, 37J35. **Keywords:** Proper degeneracy; Kepler maps; quasi–periodic motions; maximal tori; whiskered tori.

†The work has been developed under the auspices of the EU, and, especially, in the framework of the H2020-ERC Starting Grant 2015 project 677793 "Stable and Chaotic Motions in the Planetary Problem", which the author warmly acknowledges.

1 Introduction

We deal with the following situation, which we shall refer to as *outer retrograde configuration* (ORC): *two planets describe almost co–planar orbits, revolving around their common sun, in opposite sense. The outer planet has a lower angular momentum and retrograde motion.*

The purpose of this note is to prove the following results.

Theorem A

($\mathcal{S}$) *There exists a region of the phase space almost completely filled with a positive measure set of five–dimensional* KAM *tori. The motions on such tori are in* ORC*;*

($\mathcal{U}$) *there exists a region of phase space including three–dimensional whiskered* KAM *tori, with motions in* ORC*.*

($\mathcal{SU}$) *The two regions of the phase space under* ($\mathcal{S}$) *and* ($\mathcal{U}$) *above have a non–empty intersection. Therefore, there exists a region of phase space where the of motions of* ($\mathcal{S}$) *and* ($\mathcal{U}$) *co–exist.*

More detailed formulations of Theorem A will be given in the course of the paper, and we refer to such statements for more precision (see Theorem 2.1, 3.1 and 4.1, for the ($\mathcal{S}$), ($\mathcal{U}$), ($\mathcal{SU}$) statements, respectively). Nonetheless, here we aim to put in light the main underlying ideas.

The major rôle in the of the proof of Theorem A is played by the *proper–degeneracy* of the planetary problem, i.e., the independence of the unperturbed part of the Hamiltonian of the system of some action coordinate (see below). This circumstance, which is an evident obstacle (since no non–degeneracy condition will be ever verified, in absence of some action coordinate in the unperturbed part) to the application of standard perturbation theory, is instead a resource, when one wants to prove a result of this kind.

It is worth recalling that a solution to the problem of the *proper degeneracy* relatively to the application of KAM theory has been provided by V.I. Arnold in the 60s [3]. He proposed, in order to remove the degeneracy, to look at the properties of the averaged ("secular") perturbing function

$$\overline{f_{\rm POI}} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} f_{\rm POI}\, d\ell_1 d\ell_2$$

(where $\mathbb{T} := \mathbb{R}/(2\pi\mathbb{Z})$ is the one–dimensional torus) expressed in Poincaré coordinates, and, in particular, to a suitable elliptic equilibrium associated to it. He believed that (by an application of averaging theory) the missing degrees of freedom in the unperturbed part could be recovered by some truncation of the Birkhoff normal form associated to $\overline{f_{\rm POI}}$ relatively such equilibrium, and this should allow to apply a carefully designed KAM theory [3, Fundamental Theorem] so as to prove the existence of a positive measure set of quasi–periodic motions for the planetary problem.

The idea in these terms actually worked for the problem in $\mathbb{R}^2$ (plane), but did not work for the one in $\mathbb{R}^3$ (space), because a delicate question involving some non–degeneracy of such a normal form was still to be solved. It required some more study to be completed [3, 14, 22, 10, 16, 7].

Turning back to the question addressed by the paper, let us now discuss the rôle played by the *proper degeneracy*.
In impulse–position coordinates, the Hamiltonian of the three–body problem, after the translation invariance has been reduced according to the heliocentric method, is

$$\mathrm{H} = \frac{|y^{(1)}|^2}{2\mathfrak{m}_1} - \frac{\mathfrak{m}_1\mathfrak{M}_1}{|x^{(1)}|} + \frac{|y^{(2)}|^2}{2\mathfrak{m}_2} - \frac{\mathfrak{m}_2\mathfrak{M}_2}{|x^{(2)}|} + \mu\Big(-\frac{m_1 m_2}{|x^{(1)}-x^{(2)}|} + \frac{y^{(1)}\cdot y^{(2)}}{m_0}\Big) \tag{1}$$

where: m_0 is the mass of the star, μm_1, μm_2 those of the planets, with μ a very small number;

$$\mathfrak{m}_i := \frac{m_0 m_i}{m_0 + \mu m_i} = m_i + \mathrm{O}(\mu) \qquad \mathfrak{M}_i := m_0 + \mu m_i = m_0 + \mathrm{O}(\mu) \tag{2}$$

are the "reduced masses"; $y^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $x^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, and the collision set

$$\Delta := \left\{ x^{(1)} = 0 \ , \text{ or } x^{(2)} = 0 \ , \text{ or } x^{(1)} = x^{(2)} \right\}$$

is to be excluded. At this stage, H still exhibits six degrees of freedom, being (no longer translation invariant, but still) rotation invariant. A complete reduction of its integrals would allow to lower the number of degrees of freedom up to *four*.

Neglecting the expression inside parentheses, wighted by μ, one is left with the integrable problem of two uncoupled interactions of each planet with a fixed star at the origin of the $x^{(i)}$–coordinates. This is an integrable problem, but its integration carries so many integrals that, after the integration, each of the two unperturbed parts has, as mentioned, just one degree of freedom, out of three. Indeed, after the integration each of the unperturbed Hamiltonian has the expression

$$\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{K}}^{(i)}(\Lambda_i) := -\frac{\mathfrak{m}_i^3 \mathfrak{M}_i^2}{2\Lambda_i^2} \ .$$

A strong consequence of this is that a system of canonical coordinates realizing such an integration is not uniquely defined. Of course, favorite systems of coordinates (especially in view of application of KAM theory, where some non–degeneracy condition is to be verified) will be those where rotation invariance is also taken into account.

We emphasize this fact using the following notion, already introduced in [19]. We call *Kepler map* any canonical change of coordinates

$$\mathrm{K} = (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \ell_1, \ell_2, u, v) \in \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{T}^2 \times V \to (y_{\mathrm{K}}^{(1)}, y_{\mathrm{K}}^{(2)}, x_{\mathrm{K}}^{(1)}, x_{\mathrm{K}}^{(2)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{12}$$

such that

$$\frac{|y_{\mathrm{K}}^{(i)}|^2}{2\mathfrak{m}_i} - \frac{\mathfrak{m}_i \mathfrak{M}_i}{|x_{\mathrm{K}}^{(i)}|} = \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{K}}^{(i)}(\Lambda_i) \qquad i = 1,\ 2 \ ,$$

where $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, $V \subset \mathbb{R}^8$ are open and connected sets.

Thus, in principle, many possible choices of coordinates fit the definition of Kepler map, corresponding to the possible canonical changes

$$\mathrm{K} = (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \ell_1, \ell_2, u, v) \to \mathrm{K}' = (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \ell_1', \ell_2', u', v')$$

which leave the Λ_i's unvaried.

When a Kepler map is applied, the Hamiltonian takes the aspect

$$\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{K}} = \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{K}}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) + \mu f_{\mathrm{K}}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \ell_1, \ell_2, u, v)$$

where

$$\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{K}}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) = -\frac{\mathfrak{m}_1^3 \mathfrak{M}_1^2}{2\Lambda_1^2} - \frac{\mathfrak{m}_2^3 \mathfrak{M}_2^2}{2\Lambda_2^2} \ , \qquad f_{\mathrm{K}} = -\frac{m_1 m_2}{|x_{\mathrm{K}}^{(1)} - x_{\mathrm{K}}^{(2)}|} + \frac{y_{\mathrm{K}}^{(1)} \cdot y_{\mathrm{K}}^{(2)}}{m_0} \ . \tag{3}$$

Again, as in the case of Arnold's problem, we look at the secular perturbing function

$$\overline{f_{\mathrm{K}}} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} f_{\mathrm{K}} d\ell_1 d\ell_2$$

in order to remove the proper degeneracy.

The key–point, actually exploited in this paper, is that, depending on the choice of κ, $\overline{f_\kappa}$ may have a much different character. And in fact, we shall exhibit two different Kepler maps, both suited also to rotation invariance, (see Section 2 for a *partial reduction* to five degrees of freedom; Section 3.1 and Appendix A.1 for a *full reduction*, to four) such that, in one of them, $\overline{f_\kappa}$ has a purely elliptic character; in the other, a hyperbolic one. This will allow to prove completely Theorem A above.

We conclude with mentioning that the setting we use to prove whiskered tori (i.e., Equation (59)) seems to be suited to try to strengthen the result towards the (much more difficult) proof of *Arnold diffusion* [2].

Acknowledgments The author acknowledges the software MATHEMATICA, which she used to produce the Figures 1, 2 and 3.

2 Maximal tori

The existence of a positive measure set of Lagrangian tori with maximal number of frequencies for the general planetary problem, in the regime of well spaced orbits, small eccentricities and small inclinations, has been established in the papers [3, 14, 10, 16, 7, 17, 19]. We refer to such technical papers for details, to [11, 8] for reviews.

However, the cases treated in the literature above are a bit different from our situation. The papers [3, 10, 16, 7] establish the existence of maximal tori for a system of n planets in the space, with their orbits revolving in the same verse, and in the regime of very small eccentricities and mutual inclinations. The invariant set (so–called "*Kolmogorov–set*") is proved to fill almost completely the overall phase space, up to a residual set with measure going to zero with the planetary masses, the maximum of eccentricities and inclinations. A (maybe optimal) estimate about which strength such measure goes to zero is provided in [16, 7]. Note that in such papers it is possible to decide freely on the all eccentricities and all the mutual inclinations of the planets' orbits, since the number of degrees of freedom is one more the over the minimum (which, for a system of n planets in $\mathbb{R}^3$ is $3n-2$), notwithstanding that the motions evolve on constant angular momentum hyper–surfaces.

The paper [14] addresses the case of the three–body problem in the space (the analogue problem in the plane had been treated in [3]). Here the number of degrees of freedom is reduced to its minimum, four, and the free chosen frequencies are the mean motion ones and the frequencies related to the eccentricities of the two planets. The mutual inclination is not a free quantity, but depends on the previous quantities, and the fixed value of the total angular momentum of the system.

In [17, 19] maximal tori with $(3n-2)$ independent frequencies have been constructed, out of the small eccentricities and inclination constraint. In such papers, the measure of the Kolmogorov–set has been found to increase while the masses decrease and the planetary distances increase, no matter the strength eccentricities and inclinations. A precise asymptotics on the planetary distances is however imposed. Finally, the sense of revolution of the planets is the same for all of them.

To state the result with some precision, we need to introduce some technical tools. First of all, we observe that, such a configuration can be realized only if the planetary masses are tuned with the semi–major axes. More precisely, that, if we denote as "1" and "2" the inner, outer planet; as a_1, a_2, the semi–major axes of their respective instantaneous orbits around the sun; α_-, α_+, with $0 < \alpha_- < \alpha_+ < 1$, two numbers such that the semi–axes ratio $\alpha := \frac{a_1}{a_2}$ verifies

$$\alpha_- < \alpha < \alpha_+ \ , \tag{4}$$

then the following inequality needs to be satisfied

$$\frac{m_1}{m_2}\sqrt{\alpha_-} > 1 \ . \tag{5}$$

Indeed, since the motions are almost–circular, the angular momenta of the planets, G_1, G_2 are arbitrarily close to the action coordinates Λ_1, Λ_2 related to their semi–major axes, which in turn are related to the semi–axes and the mass ratio via

$$\frac{\Lambda_1}{\Lambda_2} = \frac{\mathfrak{m}_1}{\mathfrak{m}_2}\sqrt{\frac{\mathfrak{M}_1}{\mathfrak{M}_2}}\sqrt{\alpha}$$

where $\mathfrak{m}_i$, $\mathfrak{M}_i$ are as in (2). This inequality does not make conflict with (4) if one assumes that

$$k_- = \frac{\mathfrak{m}_1}{\mathfrak{m}_2}\sqrt{\frac{\mathfrak{M}_1}{\mathfrak{M}_2}}\sqrt{\alpha_-} > 1$$

whence the necessity of (5).

We next recall what is unanimously known as the *Jacobi's reduction of the nodes*. This is a procedure, due to Jacobi, Radau but especially, in their generality, to A. Deprit[1] [13, 21, 9], of diminishing the number of degrees of freedom of the three–body problem to its minimum, four. It works via the production of a system of canonical coordinates well adapted to the rotation invariance of the system (1). These coordinates are denoted as

$$\text{JRD} := (Z, \mathrm{G}, \mathrm{G}_1, \mathrm{G}_2, \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \zeta, \gamma, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \ell_1, \ell_2) \tag{6}$$

(their definition is recalled in Appendix A.1). JRD is a Kepler map in the sense given in the introduction.

The JRD–coordinates are not well defined when the eccentricities or the mutual inclination between the planets' orbital planes vanish. Namely, when some of the following equalities is verified

$$\mathrm{G}_1 = \Lambda_1 \quad \text{or} \quad \mathrm{G}_2 = \Lambda_2 \quad \text{or} \quad \mathrm{G} = \mathrm{G}_1 + \mathrm{G}_2 \quad \text{or} \quad \mathrm{G} = \mathrm{G}_1 - \mathrm{G}_2 \quad \text{or} \quad \mathrm{G} = \mathrm{G}_2 - \mathrm{G}_1 \ .$$

To obviate to this problem, it is customary to switch to a regularized version of the JRD–coordinates.

It seems not to be possible to find a system of coordinates where *any* of the above singularities is regularized and, simultaneously, the number of degrees of freedom is kept to four. However, at the expenses of enhancing the number of degrees of freedom of one unit ("partial reduction"), it is possible regularize three of them. For example, in [7], a set of regular coordinates, named RPS (see also Appendix A.2), similar in some respect to the well known Poincaré coordinates, was introduced, in order to consider motions including the singular manifold $\mathcal{M}_0 := \big\{\mathrm{G}_1 = \Lambda_1 \text{ or } \mathrm{G}_2 = \Lambda_2 \text{ or } \mathrm{G} = \mathrm{G}_1 + \mathrm{G}_2\big\}$.

In this section we are instead interested to look at the singular manifold $\mathcal{M}_\pi^+ := \big\{\mathrm{G}_1 = \Lambda_1 \text{ or } \mathrm{G}_2 = \Lambda_2 \text{ or } \mathrm{G} = \mathrm{G}_1 - \mathrm{G}_2\big\}$. The regularization that fits with this consists into considering the canonical change (which defines a new Kepler map, analogue to the RPS–map considered in [16, 7])

$$\phi_{\text{RPS}_\pi^+} : \qquad \text{JRD} \to \text{RPS}_\pi^+ := (\Lambda, \lambda, \eta, p, \xi, q) \tag{7}$$

the *complex form* of which is defined via the formulae

$$\begin{cases} \Lambda_1 = \Lambda_1 \\ \Lambda_2 = \Lambda_2 \\ t_1 = \sqrt{\Lambda_1 - \mathrm{G}_1}\, e^{\mathrm{i}(\gamma_1+\gamma+\zeta)} \\ t_2 = \sqrt{\Lambda_2 - \mathrm{G}_2}\, e^{-\mathrm{i}(\gamma_2-\gamma-\zeta)} \\ t_3 = \sqrt{\mathrm{G} - \mathrm{G}_1 + \mathrm{G}_2}\, e^{\mathrm{i}(\gamma+\zeta)} \\ T = \sqrt{\mathrm{G} - Z}\, e^{\mathrm{i}\zeta} \end{cases} \qquad \begin{cases} \lambda_1 = \ell_1 + \gamma_1 + \gamma + \zeta \\ \lambda_2 = \ell_2 + \gamma_2 - \gamma - \zeta \\ t_1^\star = -\mathrm{i}\sqrt{\Lambda_1 - \mathrm{G}_1}\, e^{-\mathrm{i}(\gamma_1+\gamma+\zeta)} \\ t_2^\star = \mathrm{i}\sqrt{\Lambda_2 - \mathrm{G}_2}\, e^{\mathrm{i}(\gamma_2-\gamma-\zeta)} \\ t_3^\star = \mathrm{i}\sqrt{\mathrm{G} - \mathrm{G}_1 + \mathrm{G}_2}\, e^{-\mathrm{i}(\gamma+\zeta)} \\ T^\star = -\mathrm{i}\sqrt{\mathrm{G} - Z}\, e^{-\mathrm{i}\zeta} \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

Here, by *complex form* we mean that (7) is a well defined (canonical and) *real* transformation, determined by the formulae above and the definitions

$$\begin{aligned} t_1 &:= \frac{\eta_1 - \mathrm{i}\xi_1}{\sqrt{2}} \qquad t_2 := \frac{\eta_2 + \mathrm{i}\xi_2}{\sqrt{2}} \qquad t_3 := \frac{p_1 + \mathrm{i}q_1}{\sqrt{2}} \qquad T := \frac{p_2 - \mathrm{i}q_2}{\sqrt{2}} \\ t_1^\star &:= \frac{\eta_1 + \mathrm{i}\xi_1}{\sqrt{2}\mathrm{i}} \qquad t_2^\star := \frac{-\eta_2 + \mathrm{i}\xi_2}{\sqrt{2}\mathrm{i}} \qquad t_3^\star := \frac{-p_1 + \mathrm{i}q_1}{\sqrt{2}\mathrm{i}} \qquad T^\star := \frac{p_2 + \mathrm{i}q_2}{\sqrt{2}\mathrm{i}} \ . \end{aligned}$$

[1]The work by A. Deprit, almost forgotten twenty years–long, has been rediscovered by the author [16]. It revealed to be crucial for the studies on Arnold theorem in [16], next published in [7].

We next fix a domain of regularity for the RPS$^+_\pi$–coordinates. The coordinates Λ_1, Λ_2 are related to the semi–major axes of the two planets. Therefore, chosen $0 < \alpha_- < \alpha_+ < 1$ as in (4) and $0 < \Lambda_- < \Lambda_+$, we fix, for such coordinates the initial domain

$$\mathcal{L}_0 := \left\{ \Lambda = (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) : \ \Lambda_- \leq \Lambda_2 \leq \Lambda_+ \ , \ k_- \Lambda_2 \leq \Lambda_1 \leq k_+ \Lambda_2 \right\} \tag{9}$$

with

$$k_\pm := \frac{\mathfrak{m}_1}{\mathfrak{m}_2} \sqrt{\frac{\mathfrak{M}_1}{\mathfrak{M}_2} \alpha_\pm} \ .$$

with the $\alpha_\pm$ corresponding to the bound for the semi–axes ratio (4). As observed above, k_- (hence, k_+) needs to be greater than one.

The coordinates $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ will be taken to run in the torus $\mathbb{T}^2$.

As for the coordinates $(t, t^\star)$, we take a domain of the form

$$\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{S} := \left\{ (t, t^\star) \in \mathbb{C}^6 : \quad |(t, t^\star)| \leq \varepsilon \right\}$$

with $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, where ε_0 is so small with respect to $(k_- - 1)\Lambda_-$ that the eccentricities are bounded away from the Levi–Civita value $0.6627\cdots$ and the angular momenta

$$\mathrm{G}_1 = \Lambda_1 - \mathrm{i} t_1 t_1^\star = \Lambda_1 - \frac{\eta_1^2 + \xi_1^2}{2} \ , \quad \mathrm{G}_2 = \Lambda_2 + \mathrm{i} t_2 t_2^\star = \Lambda_2 - \frac{\eta_2^2 + \xi_2^2}{2}$$

verify

$$\mathrm{G}_1 > \mathrm{G}_2 \ .$$

Note that $(t, t^\star) = (0, 0)$ corresponds to circular orbits with $\Lambda_1 > \Lambda_2$, as desired.

We definitely let

$$\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{S} := \mathcal{L}_0 \times \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{S} \times \mathbb{T}^2 \ .$$

The next theorem establishes the existence of maximal tori in the domain $\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{S}$.

Theorem 2.1 *There exist two numbers $0 < \varepsilon_+ < \varepsilon_0$, $0 < \alpha_+ < 1$, such that, for any $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_+$, $0 < \alpha_- < \alpha_+$, $0 < \Lambda_- < \Lambda_+$, one can find $\mu_+(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that, for any $0 < \mu < \mu_+(\varepsilon)$, in the domain $\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{S}$ there exists an invariant set $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,\mu} \subset \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{S}$ with density going to 1 as $\varepsilon \to 0$ which is foliated as*

$$\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,\mu} = \bigcup_\omega \mathcal{T}_{\omega,\varepsilon,\mu} \tag{10}$$

where $\mathcal{T}_{\omega,\varepsilon,\mu}$ is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{T}^5$, where $\mathbb{T} := \mathbb{R}/(2\pi\mathbb{Z})$ is the standard, "flat" torus. Moreover, on $\mathcal{T}_{\omega,\varepsilon,\mu}$ the motions are quasi–periodic, in retrograde, outer configuration, with suitable ("diophantine") irrational frequencies.

Theorem 2.1 is a consequence of the method discovered by V.I. Arnold [3], as interpreted in [16, 7]. We just need to adapt the techniques of in [3, 16, 7] to this case. We shall avoid a too detailed discussion, which, in view of the rich bibliography above, we feel as an easy exercise. We just remark that (and this is the only methodological difference with the case of [3, 10, 7], –and the reason of this brief discussion) compared to the situation investigated in [16, 7], in the present case the elliptic character of the "secular equilibrium" (i.e., the equilibrium for the averaged perturbing function) corresponding to the co–planar, co–circular configuration does not follow for free from the rotation symmetry of the system. Rather, it needs to be checked specifically (see equations (14)–(15) below).

As a common feature with the case considered in [7], the Hamiltonian $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{RPS}^+_\pi}$ is independent of $(T, T^\star)$ (and this is the reason that the system affords five degrees of freedom instead of six, as it happens with Poincaré coordinates). Moreover, the following expansion holds:

$$\overline{f_{\mathrm{RPS}^+_\pi}} = C_0(\Lambda) + \frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}\widehat{t^\star}\cdot\sigma(\Lambda)\widehat{t} + \frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}t_3^\star\cdot\varsigma(\Lambda)t_3 + \mathrm{O}_4(t,t^\star)\ . \tag{11}$$

where $\sigma(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2)$, $\varsigma(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2)$ are, respectively, a complex function matrix and a complex function given by (see Appendix A.2 for some detail on the derivation of these formulae)

$$\sigma(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\mathfrak{s}}{\Lambda_1} & -\mathrm{i}\frac{\widetilde{\mathfrak{s}}}{\sqrt{\Lambda_1\Lambda_2}} \\ -\mathrm{i}\frac{\widetilde{\mathfrak{s}}}{\sqrt{\Lambda_1\Lambda_2}} & -\frac{\mathfrak{s}}{\Lambda_2} \end{pmatrix} \qquad \varsigma(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2) = -\Big(\frac{1}{\Lambda_1}-\frac{1}{\Lambda_2}\Big)\mathfrak{s}\ . \tag{12}$$

with[2]

$$\mathfrak{s} \ := \ -m_1m_2\frac{\alpha}{a_2}b^{(1)}_{3/2}(\alpha) \qquad \widetilde{\mathfrak{s}} := m_1m_2\frac{\alpha}{a_2}b^{(2)}_{3/2}(\alpha)\ . \tag{13}$$

As usual, the $b^{(j)}_s(\alpha)$'s are the well known Laplace coefficients.

Note that the matrix σ, even though symmetric, *is not* not Hermitian. In principle, σ could have eigenvalues with non vanishing imaginary part (this is in fact the main difference with the case analyzed in [7]; compare also Equation (52) below) and hence $z = 0$, which is clearly an equilibrium, might, in principle, not to be elliptic. However, this is not the case. Indeed, a direct computation gives the eigenvalues σ_1 and σ_2:

$$\sigma_1,\ \sigma_2 = \frac{\mathrm{tr}\,\sigma}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(\mathrm{tr}\,\sigma)^2 - 4\det\sigma} \tag{14}$$

We have then to check that the discriminant

$$\Delta := (\mathrm{tr}\,\sigma)^2 - 4\det\sigma = (\frac{\mathfrak{s}}{\Lambda_1} - \frac{\mathfrak{s}}{\Lambda_2})^2 + \frac{4}{\Lambda_1\Lambda_2}\big(\mathfrak{s}^2 - \widetilde{\mathfrak{s}}^2\big)\ .$$

is positive. Recalling that the Laplace coefficients verify

$$b^{(j)}_s(\beta) > b^{(j+1)}_s(\beta) \quad \text{for all} \quad s>0\ , \quad j\in\mathbb{Z}\ , \quad 0<|\beta|<1\ ,$$

(see [10] for a proof), one has

$$\mathfrak{s}^2 - \widetilde{\mathfrak{s}}^2 = (m_1m_2\frac{\alpha}{a_2})^2\big((b^{(1)}_{3/2}(\alpha))^2 - (b^{(2)}_{3/2}(\alpha))^2\big) > 0\ . \tag{15}$$

Then $\Delta > 0$, therefore, the equilibrium is elliptic. In conclusion, the proof in [7] works also for the ORC, so that the thesis of Theorem 2.1 immediately follows. Note that, for completeness, one has to check *full torsion* property, which is done in Appendix A.2.

[2] Observe that also in this case the eigenvalues of the quadratic form in (11) verify "Herman resonance" $\mathrm{tr}\,\sigma + \mathrm{tr}\,\varsigma \equiv 0$ [12, 10, 1, 18].

3 Whiskered tori

The state with more precision and prove the $(\mathcal{U})$–part of Theorem A, we need some tool.
We begin with recalling the definition and the main properties of a set of canonical coordinates that have been presented in [19].

3.1 The reduction of perihelia

We call *Perihelia reduction for the three–body problem*[3] the Kepler map

$$\phi_{\mathrm{P}}: \qquad \mathrm{P} := (Z, \Theta, \chi, \Lambda, \zeta, \vartheta, \kappa, \ell) \in \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{T}^6 \to (y^{(1)}, y^{(2)}, x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3$$

where

$$\mathrm{P} := \left(Z, \Theta, \chi, \Lambda, \zeta, \vartheta, \kappa, \ell\right)$$

with $\chi = (\mathrm{G}, \mathrm{G}_2)$, $\Lambda = (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)$, $\kappa = (\mathsf{g}, \mathsf{g}_2)$, $\ell = (\ell_1, \ell_2)$, defined as follows.
Assume that the "nodes"

$$\nu_1 := k^{(3)} \times \mathrm{C}\ , \qquad \mathrm{n}_1 := \mathrm{C} \times \mathrm{P}^{(1)}\ , \qquad \nu_2 := \mathrm{P}^{(1)} \times \mathrm{C}^{(2)} \quad \mathrm{n}_2 = \mathrm{C}^{(2)} \times \mathrm{P}^{(2)}$$

do not vanish

$$\begin{cases} Z := \mathrm{C} \cdot k^{(3)} \\ \Theta := \mathrm{C} \cdot \mathrm{P}^{(1)} = \mathrm{C}^{(2)} \cdot \mathrm{P}^{(1)} \\ \mathrm{G} := \|\mathrm{C}\| \\ \mathrm{G}_2 := \|\mathrm{C}^{(2)}\| \\ \Lambda_j := \mathfrak{M}_j \sqrt{\mathfrak{m}_j a_j} \end{cases} \qquad \begin{cases} \zeta := \alpha_{k^{(3)}}(k^{(1)}, \nu_1) \\ \vartheta := \alpha_{\mathrm{P}^{(1)}}(\mathrm{n}_1, \nu_2) \\ \mathsf{g} := \alpha_{\mathrm{C}}(\nu_1, \mathrm{n}_1) \\ \mathsf{g}_2 := \alpha_{\mathrm{C}^{(2)}}(\nu_2, \mathrm{n}_2) \\ \ell_j := \text{ mean anomaly of } x^{(j)} \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

with $j = 1,\ 2$.
We recall, here, some properties of the P–coordinates, while we refer to [19] for more details.

- ⋆ The P–coordinates are homogeneous–canonical. Namely, they preserve the Liouville one–form.
- ⋆ As well as JRD coordinates, the P–coordinates are well fitted to rotation invariance of the system. This means that, since Z, ζ and G remain constant during the motion, the Hamiltonian

  $$\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{P}}(\Theta, \mathrm{G}_2, \Lambda, \vartheta, \mathsf{g}_2, \ell; \mathrm{G}) \quad = \quad -\sum_{j=1}^{2} \frac{\mathfrak{m}_j^3 \mathfrak{M}_j^2}{2\Lambda_j^2} + \mu f_{\mathrm{P}}(\Theta, \mathrm{G}_2, \Lambda, \vartheta, \mathsf{g}_2, \ell; \mathrm{G})\ .$$

  will depend explicitly only on the eight coordinates

  $$\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{red}} := (\Theta, \mathrm{G}_2, \Lambda, \vartheta, \mathsf{g}_2, \ell)$$

  and *parametrically* by G. Consistently, we denote as

  $$\phi_{\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{red}}}: \qquad \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{red}} \in \mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{T}^4 \to (y^{(1)}, y^{(2)}, x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3$$

[3] The P–coordinates are actually available for any number of planets, as discussed in [19].

the immersion given by the restriction of $\phi_{\rm P}$ to the (rotating, vertical angular momentum) manifold

$$\Big\{ Z = {\rm G} \ , \quad {\rm g} = 0 \Big\}$$

so that ${\rm H}_{\rm P} = {\rm H}_{{\rm P}_{\rm red}}$.

⋆ The ${\rm P}_{\rm red}$–coordinates defined above are well fitted to inversion symmetries.

That is, if we denote as $\mathcal{S}^-$ the sign–inversion of the (Θ, ϑ)'s coordinates

$$\mathcal{S}^-(\Theta, {\rm G}_2, \Lambda, \vartheta, \kappa, \ell) := (-\Theta, {\rm G}_2, \Lambda, 2k\pi - \vartheta, \kappa, \ell) \ ,$$

and as $\mathcal{R}_2^-$ the reflection of the Cartesian coordinates of each body

$$\mathcal{R}_2^-(y_1^{(j)}, y_2^{(j)}, y_3^{(j)}, x_1^{(j)}, x_2^{(j)}, x_3^{(j)}) = (y_1^{(j)}, -y_2^{(j)}, y_3^{(j)}, x_1^{(j)}, -x_2^{(j)}, x_3^{(j)}) \qquad j = 1, \ 2 \ ,$$

then

$$\mathcal{R}_2^- \circ \phi_{{\rm P}_{\rm red}} = \phi_{{\rm P}_{\rm red}} \circ \mathcal{S}^- \ . \tag{17}$$

This circumstance, that extends to any $n \geq 2$ [19], has a corresponding formulation for the JRD coordinates only in the case $n = 2$ (three–body problem), while is completely new for $n \geq 3$. We recall in fact that JRD coordinates do not retain inversion symmetries when $n \geq 3$.

⋆ The identity in (17) implies the following parity property

$$f_{{\rm P}_{\rm red}}(-\Theta, {\rm G}_2, \Lambda, 2k\pi - \vartheta, \kappa, \ell) = f_{{\rm P}_{\rm red}}(\Theta, {\rm G}_2, \Lambda, \vartheta, \kappa, \ell) \ , \tag{18}$$

implying, in particular, that the sections

$$(\Theta, \vartheta) = (0, \ k\pi) \qquad k = 0, 1$$

are *equilibria* to $f_{\rm P}$, which will be called *planar equilibria* (since they correspond to motions on the plane $\{y^{(2)} = x^{(2)} = 0\}$ in configuration space). Depending on the mutual directions of ${\rm C}^{(1)}$ and ${\rm C}^{(2)}$ at the equilibrium, we may distinguish three different equilibrium configurations, corresponding to the following manifolds in the phase space: with $\sigma := \ {\rm sign}\,({\rm G}_2 - {\rm G})$,

$$(\uparrow\uparrow) := \Big\{ {\rm P}_{\rm red} : \ (\Theta, \vartheta) = (0, \pi) \quad \& \quad \sigma = -1 \Big\};$$

$$(\downarrow\uparrow) := \Big\{ {\rm P}_{\rm red} : \ (\Theta, \vartheta) = (0, \pi) \quad \& \quad \sigma = +1 \Big\};$$

$$(\uparrow\downarrow) := \Big\{ {\rm P}_{\rm red} : \ (\Theta, \vartheta) = (0, 0) \Big\}.$$

(the arrows' directions remind us the sense of rotation of inner, outer planet, respectively).

In the next section, we shall be concerned with the study of the invariant equilibrium manifold $(\uparrow\downarrow)$. We shall prove that, under suitable conditions, such a manifold has an hyperbolic character to a suitable truncation of the (ℓ_1, ℓ_2)–averaged perturbing function. This fact does not hold for the case of the equilibria $(\uparrow\uparrow)$, $(\downarrow\uparrow)$, which, on the contrary, are always *elliptic* (see Proposition 3.1 and Remark 3.1 below).

- ⋆ The planar equilibria mentioned in the previous item are *regular manifolds* for the P–coordinates, which, under suitable conditions, the system may be free to reach, without enhancing the number of degrees of freedom. This should be compared with the RPS coordinates of [7] where, to have some regularity, one needs to enhance the number of degrees of freedom by one unit, or with the coordinates (6) where the number of degrees of freedom is minimum, but planar configurations are *singular*.

- ⋆ As a further advantage, the P–coordinates would make also possible to describe more than one equilibrium at time, and this is not possible with the other mentioned sets. As an important example, in Section 3.3 we shall introduce a relevant function P with the following *pendulum–like structure*: existence of an hyperbolic equilibrium at $(\uparrow\downarrow)$, of a closed separatrix through such equilibrium encircling a stable equilibrium $(\uparrow\uparrow)$ or $(\downarrow\uparrow)$. Such a structure is clearly suited to the (non–trivial) study of *Arnold diffusion* for the problem.

- ⋆ A less pleasant aspect of the P–coordinates is the expression Euclidean length of the inner planet angular momentum $\|\mathrm{C}^{(1)}\|$, which, instead of being an action coordinate, is given by

$$\|\mathrm{C}^{(1)}\| = \sqrt{\mathrm{G}^2 + \mathrm{G}_2^2 - 2\Theta^2 + 2\sqrt{\mathrm{G}^2 - \Theta^2}\sqrt{\mathrm{G}_2^2 - \Theta^2}\cos\vartheta} \ . \tag{19}$$

3.2 A domain of regularity including $(\uparrow\downarrow)$

In this section we establish a suitable domain which includes the equilibrium manifold $(\uparrow\downarrow)$ where H_{P} is regular.

We check below that the following domain is suited to the scope:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{D}}(\mathrm{G}) \ := \ \Big\{(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \mathrm{G}_2, \Theta, \vartheta) : \ (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \mathrm{G}_2) \in \mathcal{A}(\mathrm{G}), \ (\Theta, \vartheta) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathrm{G}_2, \mathrm{G})\Big\} \times \mathbb{T}^3 \ .$$

where, if $\mathcal{L}_0$ is as in (9),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(\mathrm{G}) \ &:= \ \Big\{(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \mathrm{G}_2) : \ (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathrm{G}), \ \mathrm{G}_2 \in \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \mathrm{G})\Big\} \\ \mathcal{B}(\mathrm{G}_2, \mathrm{G}) \ &:= \ \Big\{(\Theta, \vartheta) : \ |\Theta| \le \frac{1}{2}\min\{\mathrm{G}, \mathrm{G}_2\} \ , \ |\vartheta| \le \frac{\pi}{2}\Big\} \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\mathrm{G}) \ &:= \ \Big\{\Lambda = (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) : \ \Lambda \in \mathcal{L}_0 \ , \quad \Lambda_1 > \mathrm{G} + 2\sqrt{\alpha_+}\Lambda_2\Big\} \\ \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \mathrm{G}) \ &:= \ \Big(\mathrm{G}_-, \mathrm{G}_+\Big) \ , \qquad \mathrm{G}_- := 2\sqrt{\alpha_+}\Lambda_2 \qquad \mathrm{G}_+ := \min\Big\{\Lambda_1 - \mathrm{G}, \ \Lambda_2\Big\} \ . \end{aligned}$$

We need to establish two kinds of conditions.

- ⋆ *Geometric conditions*

  First of all, we need that the planets' eccentricities e_1, e_2 stay strictly[4] confined in $(0, 1)$. Then the following inequalities are to be satisfied:

$$0 < \|\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{P}}^{(1)}\| < \Lambda_1 \qquad 0 < \mathrm{G}_2 < \Lambda_2 \ , \tag{21}$$

[4] Motions for the outer planet reaching zero eccentricity might be considered, switching to the Poincaré–regularization

$$\Lambda_2 = \Lambda_2 \ , \qquad \lambda_2 = \ell_2 + \mathrm{g}_2 \ , \quad \eta_2 = \sqrt{2(\Lambda_2 - \mathrm{G}_2)}\cos\mathrm{g}_2 \qquad \xi_2 = -\sqrt{2(\Lambda_2 - \mathrm{G}_2)}\sin\mathrm{g}_2 \ .$$

with $\|\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{P}}^{(1)}\|$ as in (19). Note that $\|\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{P}}^{(1)}\|$ may vanish only for

$$(\mathrm{G}_2, \vartheta) = (\mathrm{G}, \pi) \ .$$

Since we deal with the equilibrium $(\uparrow\downarrow)$ (which holds for $(\Theta, \vartheta) = (0, 0)$), the occurrence of this equality is automatically excluded limiting the values of the coordinates (Θ, ϑ) in the set $\mathcal{B}$ in (20), since, in this case

$$\|\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{P}}^{(1)}\|^2 \geq \frac{3}{4}\mathrm{G}^2 \ . \tag{22}$$

Moreover, the two right inequalities in (21) are satisfied taking

$$\mathrm{G}_2 \leq \min\Big\{\Lambda_1 - \mathrm{G},\ \Lambda_2\Big\} = \mathrm{G}_+$$

where we have used the triangular inequality $\|\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{P}}^{(1)}\| \leq \|\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{P}}\| + \|\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{P}}^{(2)}\| = \mathrm{G} + \mathrm{G}_2$.

⋆ *Non–collision conditions*

We have to exclude possible encounters of the planets with the sun and each other. Collisions of the inner planet with the sun are excluded by (20). Indeed, using (22), with $\Lambda_1^+ := k_+\Lambda_2^+$,

$$1 - e_1^2 = \frac{\|\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{P}}^{(1)}\|^2}{\Lambda_1^2} \geq \frac{3}{4}\frac{\mathrm{G}^2}{(\Lambda_1^+)^2}$$

whence the minimum distance of the inner planet with the sun $a_1(1 - e_1)$ is positive. In order to avoid planetary collisions, it is typical to ensure the following inequality:

$$a_1(1 + e_1) < a_2(1 - e_2) \ .$$

A sufficient condition for it is

$$\mathrm{G}_2 \geq 2\sqrt{\alpha_+}\Lambda_2 = \mathrm{G}_- \ .$$

Indeed, if this inequality is satisfied, one has

$$a_1(1 + e_1) < 2a_1 \leq \frac{a_2}{2}\frac{\mathrm{G}_2^2}{\Lambda_2^2} = \frac{a_2}{2}(1 - e_2^2) < a_2(1 - e_2) \ .$$

3.3 Bifurcations to instability in the secular problem

The manifold $(\uparrow\downarrow)$ defined in the previous section is invariant to f_{P}. Then, it is invariant to the "secular" (i.e. , averaged) perturbing function

$$\overline{f_{\mathrm{P}}} := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} f_{\mathrm{P}} d\ell_1 d\ell_2 \ . \tag{23}$$

It is possible (see Appendix B) to write $\overline{f_{\mathrm{P}}}$ as

$$\overline{f_{\mathrm{P}}} = -\frac{m_1 m_2}{a_2}\Big(1 + \alpha^2(\mathrm{P}_0 + \mathrm{P}) + \alpha^3\widehat{\mathrm{P}}\Big) \tag{24}$$

where P_0 is independent of (Θ, ϑ) and P vanishes for $(\Theta, \vartheta) = (0, 0)$. Moreover, it turns out that both P_0 and P do not depend of g_2. Therefore, it is quite natural to study the character of $(\uparrow\downarrow)$ to P, accordingly to the values of $(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \mathrm{G}_2)$.

Proposition 3.1 *For any fixed* $\mathrm{G} \in \mathbb{R}_+$*, there exist suitable domains* $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U}} \subset \mathcal{A}$*,* $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{U}} \subset \mathcal{B}$ *depending only on* G *such that* $(\Theta, \vartheta) = (0,0)$ *is an elliptic equilibrium point to* $\mathrm{P}_{\mathcal{U}} := \mathrm{P}\big|_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U}} \times \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{U}}}$*. More precisely, there exist two functions* ω*,* Ω *of* Λ_1*,* Λ_2*,* G_2 *and the parameter* G*, with* $\omega > 0$ *such that, in terms of the canonical coordinates*

$$p_0 := \frac{\Theta - \omega\vartheta}{\sqrt{2\omega}} \ , \qquad q_0 := \frac{\Theta + \omega\vartheta}{\sqrt{2\omega}} \tag{25}$$

one has

$$\mathrm{P}_{\mathcal{U}} = \Omega p_0 q_0 + \mathrm{O}(p_0, q_0)^4 \ .$$

We shall prove the proposition with

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega &:= -\frac{3}{4}\frac{\Lambda_2^3}{\Lambda_1^2 \mathrm{G}_2^4}\sqrt{\big(5\Lambda_1^2\mathrm{G} - (\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{G}_2)^2(4\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{G}_2)\big)\big(\mathrm{G}_2 - \mathrm{G}\big)} \\
\omega &:= \mathrm{G}\mathrm{G}_2\sqrt{\frac{\mathrm{G}_2 - \mathrm{G}}{5\Lambda_1^2\mathrm{G} - (\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{G}_2)^2(4\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{G}_2)}} \\
\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathrm{G}) &:= \Big\{(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathrm{G}) \ , \quad \mathrm{G}_2 \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \mathrm{G})\Big\} \\
\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathrm{G}) &:= \Big\{(\Theta, \vartheta) : \ |\Theta| \le \frac{\mathrm{G}}{2} \ , \ |\vartheta| \le \frac{\pi}{2}\Big\}
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathrm{G}) &:= \Big\{\Lambda = (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \in \mathcal{L}_0 : \ 5\Lambda_1^2\mathrm{G} - (\mathrm{G} + 2\sqrt{\alpha_+}\Lambda_1)^2(4\mathrm{G} + 2\sqrt{\alpha_+}\Lambda_1) > 0 \ , \\
&\qquad \Lambda_2 > \mathrm{G} \ , \ \Lambda_1 > \max\{\mathrm{G} + 2\sqrt{\alpha_+}\Lambda_2, \ 2\mathrm{G}\}\Big\} \\
\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \mathrm{G}) &:= \Big(\overline{\mathrm{G}}_-, \ \overline{\mathrm{G}}_+\Big)
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_0$ is as in (9) and, if $\mathrm{G}^\star(\Lambda_1, \mathrm{G})$ is the unique positive root of the cubic polynomial $\mathrm{G}_2 \to 5\Lambda_1^2\mathrm{G} - (\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{G}_2)^2(4\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{G}_2)$, then

$$\overline{\mathrm{G}}_- := \max\{2\sqrt{\alpha_+}\Lambda_2, \ \mathrm{G}\} \qquad \overline{\mathrm{G}}_+ := \min\{\Lambda_2, \ \mathrm{G}^\star\} \ . \tag{28}$$

Implicitly, we shall prove that

$$\overline{\mathrm{G}}_- < \overline{\mathrm{G}}_+ \ . \tag{29}$$

Proof The expansion of P in (59) around $(0,0)$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{P} &= -\frac{1}{8}\frac{\Lambda_2^3}{\Lambda_1^2\mathrm{G}_2^5} \\
&\quad \times\Big[\frac{3}{\mathrm{G}}a(\Lambda_1, \mathrm{G}_2; \mathrm{G})\Theta^2 + 3\mathrm{G}\mathrm{G}_2^2 b(\mathrm{G}_2; \mathrm{G})\vartheta^2 + o_2(\Theta, \vartheta)\Big]
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$a(\Lambda_1, \mathrm{G}_2; \mathrm{G}) := 5\Lambda_1^2\mathrm{G} - (\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{G}_2)^2(4\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{G}_2) \quad \text{and} \quad b(\mathrm{G}_2; \mathrm{G}) := \mathrm{G} - \mathrm{G}_2 \ . \tag{30}$$

Both $\mathrm{G}_2 \to a(\Lambda_1, \mathrm{G}_2; \mathrm{G})$ and $\mathrm{G}_2 \to b(\mathrm{G}_2; \mathrm{G})$, as functions of G_2 decrease monotonically from a positive value (respectively[5], $\Lambda_1^2(5\Lambda_2^2 - 4\mathrm{G}^2)$ and G) to $-\infty$ as G_2 increases from $\mathrm{G}_2 = 0$ to $\mathrm{G}_2 = +\infty$. The function $a(\Lambda_1, \mathrm{G}_2; \mathrm{G})$ changes its sign for G equal to a suitable unique positive value $\mathrm{G}^\star(\Lambda_1, \mathrm{G})$, while $b(\mathrm{G}_2; \mathrm{G})$ does it for $\mathrm{G}_2 = \mathrm{G}$. We note that (i) inequality $\mathrm{G} < \min\{\mathrm{G}_+, \ \mathrm{G}^\star\}$

[5]Recall that $\Lambda_1 > \mathrm{G}$, so that $5\Lambda_1^2 - 4\mathrm{G}^2 > \mathrm{G}^2 > 0$.

follows immediately from the assumptions (27) (in particular, the two las ones) and (ii), more in general, that $G^\star \lesseqgtr G$ is equivalent to $\Lambda_1 \lesseqgtr 2G$. Since, for our purposes, we have to exclude $G^\star = G$ (otherwise, $a(\Lambda_1, G_2; G)$ and $b(G_2; G)$ would be simultaneously positive and simultaneously negative, and no hyperbolicity would be possible), we distinguish two cases.

(a) $G > 2\sqrt{\alpha_+}\Lambda_2$ and $G + 2\sqrt{\alpha_+}\Lambda_2 < \Lambda_1 < 2G$. In this case $G^\star < G$. We show that no such $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{U}$ can exist in this case. In fact, since $G^\star < G$, in order that the interval $(G^\star, G)$ and the set $\mathcal{G}$ have a non–empty intersection, one should have, necessarily, $G_+ = \sup \mathcal{G} > G^\star$, hence, in particular, $\Lambda_1 - G > G^\star$. Using the definition of $G^\star$, this would imply $\Lambda_1 > 2G$, which is a contradiction.

(b) $\Lambda_1 > \max\{2G,\ G + 2\sqrt{\alpha_+}\Lambda_2\}$. In this case $G < G^\star < \Lambda_1 - G$. In order that the interval $(G, G^\star)$ and the set $\mathcal{G}$ have a non–empty intersection, we need

$$G_- < G^\star \qquad \text{and} \qquad G_+ > G \tag{31}$$

and such intersection will be given by the interval $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{U}$ as in (27). Note that the definition of $\overline{\Gamma}_+$ does not include $\Lambda_1 - G$ in the brackets because, as noticed, $G^\star < \Lambda_1 - G$. But (31) are equivalent to (27). ∎

Remark 3.1

⋆ The analysis worked out in Proposition 3.1 would have worked word–by–word (without affecting the results of Theorems 3.1, 4.1 below) using, instead of the coordinates in (16), the coordinates

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{P}} := \left(Z, \widetilde{\Theta}, \chi, \Lambda, \zeta, \widetilde{\vartheta}, \widetilde{\kappa}, \ell\right)$$

where $\widetilde{\Theta}$, $\widetilde{\vartheta}$, $\widetilde{\kappa} = (\widetilde{\mathrm{g}}, \widetilde{\mathrm{g}}_2)$ are defined, in terms of the coordinates (6), as

$$\widetilde{\Theta} = \sqrt{2(G - G_1 + G_2)}\cos\gamma_1\ , \quad \widetilde{\vartheta} = -\sqrt{2(G - G_1 + G_2)}\sin\gamma_1\ , \quad \widetilde{\mathrm{g}} = \gamma + \gamma_1\ , \quad \widetilde{\mathrm{g}}_2 = \gamma_1 + \gamma_2$$

while the remaining ones are the same (of those with the same names) as in (16). We remark however that the $\widetilde{\mathrm{P}}$–coordinates do not exhibit the advantages mentioned in Section 3.1 above for the P's. In particular, the $\widetilde{\mathrm{P}}$'s are local coordinates well fitted to the equilibrium $(\uparrow\downarrow)$ only and not to the others, and the pendulum structure for them does not exist.

⋆ The "bifurcation" towards the hyperbolic behavior that Proposition 3.1 talks about do not appear in the case of the equilibria $(\uparrow\uparrow)$ and $(\downarrow\uparrow)$, which, at contrast, are always *elliptic*.

Indeed, in such cases, one obtains an expansion analogue to (24)–(59), with the coefficients a, b in (30) to be replaced by

$$\widehat{a} = 5\Lambda_1^2 G - (G - G_2)^2(4G - G_2)\ , \qquad \widehat{b} = G + G_2\ .$$

Clearly, $\widehat{b}$ is positive for all G_2 and $\widehat{a}$ is so for $G_2 \geq 4G$. On the other hand, when $G_2 < 4G$, inequality $|G - G_2| < \Lambda_1$ implies

$$\widehat{a} \geq \Lambda_1^2(G + G_2) > 0\ .$$

Therefore, $\widehat{a}$ and $\widehat{b}$ have always the same (positive) sign.

3.4 Three–dimensional whiskered tori

Let $\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{U}$, $\mathcal{B}_\mathcal{U}$ as in Proposition 3.1. On the domain

$$\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{U} := \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{B}_\mathcal{U} \times \mathbb{T}^3$$

consider the "averaged, α–truncated" Hamiltonian

$$\mathrm{H}_0(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,\mathrm{G}_2,\Theta,\vartheta;\mathrm{G}) := \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{K}}(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2) - \mu\frac{m_1m_2}{a_2}\Big(1+\alpha^2(\mathrm{P}_0+\mathrm{P})\Big) \tag{32}$$

where h_{K} is as in (3), P_0, P as in (24).

H_0 possesses, by Proposition 3.1, a hyperbolic fixed point at $(\Theta,\vartheta)=(0,0)$ and hence a family of three–dimensional tori having equation

$$\mathcal{T}_{\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star} = \Big\{(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,\mathrm{G}_2)=(\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star)\ ,\ (\ell_1,\ell_2,\mathsf{g}_2)\in\mathbb{T}^3\ ,\quad (\Theta,\vartheta)=(0,0)\Big\}$$

parametrized by $(\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star)\in\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathrm{G})$. The tori $\mathcal{T}_{\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star}$ may also be viewed as the intersection of two four–dimensional manifolds, the *whiskers*, surrounded of orbits of H_0 which approach/leave the torus at an exponential rate, with velocity $\Omega^\star := \Omega(\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star;\mathrm{G})$. Their equation, closely to the equilibrium, is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{s,loc}}_{\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star,\varepsilon} &= \Big\{(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,\mathrm{G}_2)=(\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star)\ ,\ (\ell_1,\ell_2,\mathsf{g}_2)\in\mathbb{T}^3\ ,\quad q_0=0\ ,\ |p_0|<\varepsilon\Big\}\\
\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{u,loc}}_{\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star,\varepsilon} &= \Big\{(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,\mathrm{G}_2)=(\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star)\ ,\ (\ell_1,\ell_2,\mathsf{g}_2)\in\mathbb{T}^3\ ,\quad p_0=0\ ,\ |q_0|<\varepsilon\Big\}
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where p_0, q_0 are as in (25), with ω replaced by $\omega^* := \omega(\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star;\mathrm{G})$. More in general, closely to each fixed torus $\mathcal{T}_{\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star}$, the trajectories of H_0 are partially hyperbolic, and evolve in the full (eight–)dimensional set

$$\mathcal{W} = \bigcup_{(\overline{\Lambda}_1,\overline{\Lambda}_2,\overline{\mathrm{G}}_2)\in\mathcal{A}(\mathrm{G}),|\overline{\zeta}|<\varepsilon/2} \mathcal{W}_{\overline{\Lambda}_1,\overline{\Lambda}_2,\overline{\mathrm{G}}_2,\overline{\zeta},\varepsilon}$$

foliated by the four–dimensional invariant manifolds

$$\mathcal{W}_{\overline{\Lambda}_1,\overline{\Lambda}_2,\overline{\mathrm{G}}_2,\overline{\zeta},\varepsilon} = \Big\{(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,\mathrm{G}_2)=(\overline{\Lambda}_1,\overline{\Lambda}_2,\overline{\mathrm{G}}_2)\ ,\ (\ell_1,\ell_2,\mathsf{g}_2)\in\mathbb{T}^3\ ,\quad p_0q_0=\overline{\zeta}\ ,\quad |(p_0,q_0)|<\varepsilon\Big\}$$

for any $(\overline{\Lambda}_1,\overline{\Lambda}_2,\overline{\mathrm{G}}_2)\in\mathcal{A}(\mathrm{G})$ and $|\overline{\zeta}|<\varepsilon/2$, and the local whiskers in (33) correspond to

$$\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{s,loc}}_{\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star,\varepsilon} := \mathcal{W}_{\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star,0,\varepsilon}\bigcap\{q_0=0\}\ ,\qquad \mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{u,loc}}_{\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star,\varepsilon} := \mathcal{W}_{\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star,0,\varepsilon}\bigcap\{p_0=0\}\ .$$

It turns out that this description persists in the full system, at the expenses, for what concerns the surviving tori, of switching to a suitable "Cantor–like" subset of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathrm{G})$ and, for the dynamics around each preserved torus, to change the neighborhood $\mathcal{W}$ with a lower–dimensional set $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}$.

Indeed, we have the following result, consisting of a more precise statement of the $\mathcal{U}$–part of Theorem A.

Theorem 3.1 *There exists a number α_+ such that for any $\alpha_-<\alpha_+$, $0<a_-<a_+$, and any $\alpha_-<\alpha<\alpha_+$, one can find $\mu_+(\alpha)$ such that, for any $0<\mu<\mu(\alpha)$ the following holds. There exists a positive measure set $\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{nr}}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathrm{G})\subset\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathrm{G})$, tending to fill the whole $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathrm{G})$ as (α,μ) tend to zero, such that, for any $(\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star)\in\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{nr}}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathrm{G})$ one can find a three–dimensional invariant manifold*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star}\subset\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U}}\times\Big\{(0,0)\Big\}\times\mathbb{T}^3=:\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{U}} \tag{34}$$

which is (α,μ)–close to $\mathcal{T}_{\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star}$, surrounded of quasi–periodic motions with irrational (diophantine) frequencies. Moreover, for any $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star}$ there exists a five–dimensional set $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}$ including $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star}$ which foliates as

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{W}} = \bigcup_{|\zeta|<\varepsilon/2}\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\zeta,\varepsilon}$$

where any $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\zeta,\varepsilon}$ *is an invariant manifold having the form*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\zeta,\varepsilon} = \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\overline{\Lambda}_1,\overline{\Lambda}_2,\overline{\mathrm{G}}_2,\zeta,\varepsilon}$$

for suitable $\overline{\Lambda}_1$, $\overline{\Lambda}_2$, $\overline{\mathrm{G}}_2$ *depending of* $(\Lambda_1^\star, \Lambda_2^\star, \mathrm{G}_2^\star, \zeta, \mu, \alpha, \varepsilon)$, *and* $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\overline{\Lambda}_1,\overline{\Lambda}_2,\overline{\mathrm{G}}_2,\zeta,\varepsilon}$ (α,μ)*–close to* $\mathcal{W}_{\overline{\Lambda}_1,\overline{\Lambda}_2,\overline{\mathrm{G}}_2,\overline{\zeta},\varepsilon}$. *In particular,* $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\zeta,\varepsilon}$ *includes suitable four–dimensional sets ("whiskers")* $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^{\mathrm{s,loc}}_{\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star,\varepsilon}$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^{\mathrm{u,loc}}_{\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star,\varepsilon}$ (α,μ)*–close to the unperturbed whiskers* $\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{s,loc}}_{\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star,\varepsilon}$, $\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{u,loc}}_{\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star,\varepsilon}$.

The proof of this theorem goes through joining a well–established technique, aimed to eliminate the "proper degeneracy" of the problem (firstly proposed by V.I.Arnold [3] for the case of maximal KAM tori; see also [6]) to a KAM scheme for partially hyperbolic systems, as proposed, `e.g.`, in [5, 23]. It will be just briefly sketched here.

Proof (sketch) One starts with the Hamiltonian of the system written in P–coordinates:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{P}} &= \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{K}}(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2) + \mu\Big(\frac{y_{\mathrm{P}}^{(1)}\cdot y_{\mathrm{P}}^{(2)}}{m_0} - \frac{m_1 m_2}{\|x_{\mathrm{P}}^{(1)} - x_{\mathrm{P}}^{(2)}\|}\Big) \\ &= \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{K}}(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2) + \mu f_{\mathrm{P}}(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,\mathrm{G}_2,\Theta,\ell_1,\ell_2,\mathsf{g}_2,\vartheta;\mathrm{G}) \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Then, one proceeds in five steps.

Step 1 Let s, r small positive numbers such that H_{P} is real–analytic on the (r,s)–complex neighborhood of $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}$

$$(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}})_{r,s} := (\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U}})_r \times (\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{U}})_r \times \mathbb{T}^3_s \ .$$

Let $\mathcal{L}^{\mathrm{nr}}_{\mathcal{U}} \subset \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{U}}$ be the (Λ_1,Λ_2) pre–images under the frequency map $(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2) \to \omega_{\mathrm{K}}(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2)$, where $\omega_{\mathrm{K}} := \partial \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{K}}$, of (γ,τ)–diophantine numbers, for some small γ and large τ, and let $\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{nr}}_{\mathcal{U}} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U}}$, $\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{nr}}_{\mathcal{U}} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}$ be correspondingly defined.

Step 2 Properly–degenerate averaging theory [4, 6] based on [20] allows to conjugate, in the domain $(\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{nr}}_{\mathcal{U}})_{r/2,s/6}$, the Hamiltonian H_{P} in (35) to

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathrm{P}} &= \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{K}}(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2) + \mu\overline{f_{\mathrm{P}}}(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,\mathrm{G}_2,\Theta,\mathsf{g}_2,\vartheta;\mathrm{G}) + \mu^2\overline{\overline{f_{\mathrm{P}}}}(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,\mathrm{G}_2,\Theta,\mathsf{g}_2,\vartheta;\mathrm{G}) \\ &+ \mu e^{-K}\overline{\overline{\overline{f_{\mathrm{P}}}}}(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,\mathrm{G}_2,\Theta,\ell_1,\ell_2,\mathsf{g}_2,\vartheta;\mathrm{G}) \end{aligned}$$

where $\overline{f_{\mathrm{P}}}$ is as in (23), $\overline{\overline{f_{\mathrm{P}}}}$, $\overline{\overline{\overline{f_{\mathrm{P}}}}}$ are bounded as $\mu \to 0$, K is some arbitrarily large parameter.

Step 3 Choosing μ and K^{-1} suitably small with respect to α and using (24), one rewrites $\overline{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathrm{P}}$ as

$$\overline{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathrm{P}} = \mathrm{H}_0 + \mu\alpha^3\overline{\mathrm{H}}_1$$

with H_0 as in (32) and $\overline{\mathrm{H}}_1$ bounded for μ and α small.

Step 4 Normal form theory [15] allows to find a system of canonical coordinates $(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,\mathrm{G}_2,p,\widehat{\ell}_1,\widehat{\ell}_2,\widehat{\mathsf{g}}_2,q)$ ("normal coordinates") which sees the $\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,\mathrm{G}_2$ unchanged, sends $(\Theta,\vartheta) = (0,0)$ to $(p,q) = (0,0)$ and casts $\overline{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathrm{P}}$ to

$$\widehat{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathrm{P}}(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,\mathrm{G}_2,\Theta,\ell_1,\ell_2,\mathsf{g}_2,\vartheta;\mathrm{G},\mu) = \widehat{\mathrm{H}}_0(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,\mathrm{G}_2,\Theta,\ell_1,\ell_2,\mathsf{g}_2,\vartheta;\mathrm{G},\mu) + \mu\alpha^3\widehat{\mathrm{H}}_1(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,\mathrm{G}_2,\Theta,\vartheta;\mathrm{G},\mu)$$

with

$$\widehat{\mathrm{H}}_0(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,\mathrm{G}_2,\Theta,\vartheta;\mathrm{G},\mu) = \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{K}}(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2) - \mu\frac{m_1 m_2}{a_2}\Big(1 + \alpha^2(\mathrm{P}_0 + \widehat{\mathrm{P}})\Big) \tag{36}$$

and $\widehat{\mathrm{P}}$ a function of $\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,\mathrm{G}_2$ and $\zeta := pq$ only.

Step 5 A suitable quantitative KAM theory for small perturbation of partially hyperbolic Hamiltonians (obtained, `e.g.`, with a "two–scale" – in the sense of [3, 6]– scheme adapted to the algorithm in [5, 23]) can be applied to (36) to obtain the thesis of Theorem 3.1.

We remark that the parity of f_{P} (see Equation (18)) easily implies that the tori $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star}$ not only stay (α,μ)–close to the unperturbed tori $\mathcal{T}_{\Lambda_1^\star,\Lambda_2^\star,\mathrm{G}_2^\star}$, but verify the inclusion in (34). ∎

4 Co–existence of tori

In this section, we aim to prove that the stable and unstable motions constructed in the previous sections (Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 3.1 above) have a common domain of existence.

More precisely, we prove that

Theorem 4.1 *Let α_+ be so small that Theorems 2.1–3.1 hold and, in addition, $\alpha_+ < \frac{1}{16}$. There exist universal numbers $1 < \underline{k} < \overline{k}$ such that, if*

$$\alpha_- < \frac{\underline{k}^2}{\overline{k}^2}\alpha_+ \ , \qquad \frac{\overline{k}}{\sqrt{\alpha_+}} < \frac{\mathfrak{m}_1}{\mathfrak{m}_2}\sqrt{\frac{\mathfrak{M}_1}{\mathfrak{M}_2}} < \frac{\underline{k}}{\sqrt{\alpha_-}}$$

one can find a domain in phase space almost completely filled of five–dimensional quasi–periodic tori, containing also a positive relative set of whiskered three–dimensional tori.

To enter in the details of the proof of Theorem 4.1, we need some preparation. Firstly, we need to recall that, while the coordinates (8) that have been used to obtain Theorem 2.1 realize just a *partial reduction* by the total angular momentum of the system (47), the coordinates (16) used for Theorem 3.1 realize a *full reduction*. This means that, if one fixes in advance the value of G, the five frequencies each torus $\mathcal{T}_{\omega,\varepsilon,\mu}$ in the statement of Theorem 2.1 is characterized by, are not all independent, but just four of them are.

However, analogue arguments as the ones in [7, Section 10] (see also [17, Section 4.2]), allow to infer that, *in the eight–dimensional*[6] G*–section*

$$\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{S}} := \left\{(\Lambda, \lambda, t, t^\star) \in \mathcal{L}_0 \times \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathcal{S}} \times \mathbb{T}^2 \subset \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}} : \ (47) \text{ holds}\right\} \tag{37}$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathcal{S}} \subset \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is chosen so that the eccentricity e_1 of the inner planet is of order ε but far away from zero, one finds an invariant set $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{\varepsilon,\mu} \subset \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{S}}$ having density close to 1 as $\varepsilon \to 0$, which, analogously to (10), foliates as

$$\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{\varepsilon,\mu} = \bigcup_{\widehat{\omega}} \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{\widehat{\omega},\varepsilon,\mu} \tag{38}$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{\widehat{\omega},\varepsilon,\mu}$ is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{T}^4$, and is crossed by quasi–periodic motions for the system, with irrational, four–dimensional frequencies $\widehat{\omega} \in (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q})^4$.

The tori $\mathcal{T}_{\omega,\varepsilon,\mu}$ of $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,\mu} \cap \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{S}}$, where $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,\mu}$ is as in (10), are then nothing else than the lift of the tori $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{\widehat{\omega},\varepsilon,\mu}$ of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{\varepsilon,\mu}$ in (38), letting G vary.

We then prove that the eight–dimensional domain $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{S}}$ in (37) includes the six–dimensional set $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{U}}$ in (34). Since such two sets are described with different systems of coordinates, we firstly need to describe them with a common one. Translated in terms of the coordinates (16), the set $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{S}}$ becomes (at the expenses of diminishing ε, if necessary)

$$\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}} \times \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}} \times \mathbb{T}^3$$

where, if

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathrm{G}) := \left\{\Lambda = (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \in \mathcal{L}_0 : \ |\Lambda_1 - \Lambda_2 - \mathrm{G}| < \varepsilon\right\} , \qquad \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{S}}(\Lambda_2) := \left\{\mathrm{G}_2 : \ 0 < \Lambda_2 - \mathrm{G}_2 < \varepsilon\right\} \tag{39}$$

then

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}} := \left\{(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \mathrm{G}_2) : \ (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}} \ , \ \mathrm{G}_2 \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{S}}(\Lambda_2)\right\} \tag{40}$$

[6] Proceeding as in [7, Section 10], the conservation of G allows to regard $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{S}}$ as a eight–dimensional symplectic sub–manifold.

while

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}} := \Big\{ (\Theta, \vartheta) : \ |(\Theta, \vartheta)| < \varepsilon \Big\} \ .$$

Since, obviously, $(0,0) \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}$, all we have to do is to check that the intersection $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}} \cap \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is non–empty. We do this below.

Proof of Theorem 4.1 We prove the Theorem with

$$\underline{k} = \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\frac{3}{10}(69 + 11\sqrt{33})} \sim 1.57 \ , \quad \overline{k} = 2 \ . \tag{41}$$

Recalling the definition of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U}}$ in (26)–(27) and the definition of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}}$ in (39)–(40), non empty–ness of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}} \cap \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is equivalent to the two conditions

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathrm{G}) \cap \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathrm{G}) \neq \emptyset$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{S}}(\Lambda_2) \cap \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \mathrm{G}) \neq \emptyset \quad \forall \ (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathrm{G}) \cap \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathrm{G}) \ .$$

It wilt be enough to check that

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathrm{G}) \cap \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathrm{G}) \cap \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{SU}}(\mathrm{G}) \neq \emptyset \tag{42}$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{S}}(\Lambda_2) \cap \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \mathrm{G}) \neq \emptyset \quad \forall \ (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathrm{G}) \cap \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathrm{G}) \cap \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{SU}}(\mathrm{G}) \ , \tag{43}$$

where, if $\overline{\mathrm{G}}_{\pm}$ are as in (28), $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{SU}}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{SU}} := \Big\{ (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) : \ \overline{\mathrm{G}}_{+} = \Lambda_2 \Big\} \ . \tag{44}$$

Note that (43) is certainly satisfied provided (42) is, since in fact, for $(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathrm{G}) \cap \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathrm{G}) \cap \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{SU}}(\mathrm{G})$,

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{S}}(\Lambda_2) \cap \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \mathrm{G}) = \Big\{ \mathrm{G}_2 : \ \max\{\overline{\mathrm{G}}_{-}, \Lambda_2 - \varepsilon\} < \mathrm{G}_2 < \Lambda_2 \Big\}$$

which is well–defined by (28)–(29).

On the other hand, in view of the definition of $\overline{\mathrm{G}}_{+}$ in (28), and of $\mathrm{G}^{\star}$ a few lines above, $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{SU}}$ in (44) is equivalently defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{SU}} = \Big\{ (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) : \ 5\Lambda_1^2 \mathrm{G} - (\mathrm{G} + \Lambda_2)^2 (4\mathrm{G} + \Lambda_2) > 0 \Big\} \ . \tag{45}$$

Therefore, in view of this definition and the definitions of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}$, $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{U}}$ in (27) and (39), one sees that the set on the left hand side in (42) is determined by inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Lambda_- < \Lambda_2 < \Lambda_+ \\
&k_- \Lambda_2 \leq \Lambda_1 \leq k_+ \Lambda_2 \\
&5\Lambda_1^2 \mathrm{G} - (\mathrm{G} + 2\sqrt{\alpha_+}\Lambda_1)^2 (4\mathrm{G} + 2\sqrt{\alpha_+}\Lambda_1) > 0 \\
&\Lambda_2 > \mathrm{G} \\
&\Lambda_1 > \max\{\mathrm{G} + 2\sqrt{\alpha_+}\Lambda_2, \ 2\mathrm{G}\} \\
&|\Lambda_1 - \Lambda_2 - \mathrm{G}| < \varepsilon \\
&5\Lambda_1^2 \mathrm{G} - (\mathrm{G} + \Lambda_2)^2 (4\mathrm{G} + \Lambda_2) > 0
\end{aligned}$$

We observe that no phase point[7] (Λ_1, Λ_2) with $\Lambda_1 - \Lambda_2 - \mathrm{G} < 0$ belongs to $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}$, and that inequality $\Lambda_1 > 2\mathrm{G}$ is implied by $\Lambda_2 > \mathrm{G}$ and (45). Then, we divide such inequalities in three groups, so as to rewrite the set (42) as the intersection of the sets

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1 &:= \Big\{(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) :\ \Lambda_- < \Lambda_2 < \Lambda_+,\ \Lambda_2 > \mathrm{G},\ \Lambda_1 > 2\mathrm{G}\ , \\
&\qquad \max\{k_- \Lambda_2,\ (\mathrm{G} + \Lambda_2)\sqrt{\frac{4\mathrm{G} + \Lambda_2}{5\mathrm{G}}}\} < \Lambda_1 \leq k_+ \Lambda_2\Big\} \\
\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_2 &:= \Big\{(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) :\ 0 < \Lambda_1 - \Lambda_2 - \mathrm{G} < \varepsilon,\ \Lambda_1 > \mathrm{G} + 2\sqrt{\alpha_+}\Lambda_2\ ,\ \Lambda_2 > \mathrm{G}\Big\} \\
\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_3 &:= \Big\{(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) :\ 5\Lambda_1^2 \mathrm{G} - (\mathrm{G} + 2\sqrt{\alpha_+}\Lambda_1)^2(4\mathrm{G} + 2\sqrt{\alpha_+}\Lambda_1) > 0\ ,\ \Lambda_1 > 2\mathrm{G}\Big\}
\end{aligned}$$

We now aim to choose the parameters $\Lambda_\pm$, $k_\pm$ and α_+ so as to find a non–empty intersection of the sets a above.

Let us denote as $\mathcal{C}$ the curve, in the (Λ_2, Λ_1)–plane, having equation

$$\mathcal{C} : \qquad \Lambda_1 = (\mathrm{G} + \Lambda_2)\sqrt{\frac{4\mathrm{G} + \Lambda_2}{5\mathrm{G}}} \tag{46}$$

Let

$$\Lambda_2 = k\Lambda_1$$

be any straight line through the origin. The straight line intersecting $\mathcal{C}$ into the point $(\underline{\Lambda_2}, \underline{\Lambda_1}) = (\mathrm{G}, 2\mathrm{G})$ has $\overline{k} = 2$, and intersects this curve, also in the higher point

$$(\overline{\Lambda_2}, \overline{\Lambda_1}) = (\frac{1}{2}(13 + \sqrt{185}), (13 + \sqrt{185}))\mathrm{G}\ .$$

Any other line with $k > \overline{k}$ has a lower intersection $(\underline{\Lambda_2}', \underline{\Lambda_1}')$, with $\underline{\Lambda_2}' < \mathrm{G}$ and $\underline{\Lambda_1}' < 2\mathrm{G}$ and a higher intersection $(\overline{\Lambda_2}', \overline{\Lambda_1}')$ with $\overline{\Lambda_2}' > \overline{\Lambda_2}$ and $\overline{\Lambda_1}' > \overline{\Lambda_1}$.

The last straight line, in the plane (Λ_2, Λ_1), through the origin intersecting $\mathcal{C}$ is the tangent line, and it is easy to compute (see Appendix C for the detail of the comutations) that such a tangent line has slope has slope $\underline{k}$ as in (41) (Figure 1). We then conclude that, as soon as we choose $k_- < \underline{k}$, $k_+ > \overline{k}$, $\Lambda_- < \underline{\Lambda_2}$, $\Lambda_+ > \overline{\Lambda_2}$, we have the inclusion

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1 \supset \mathcal{L}_1 := \Big\{(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) :\ (\mathrm{G} + \Lambda_2)\sqrt{\frac{4\mathrm{G} + \Lambda_2}{5\mathrm{G}}}\} < \Lambda_1 \leq 2\Lambda_2\Big\}\ .$$

Let us now turn to $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_2$. Since we are assuming $\alpha_+ < \frac{1}{16}$, we conclude that the strip

$$\mathcal{L}_2 := \Big\{(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) :\ 0 < \Lambda_1 - \Lambda_2 - \mathrm{G} < \varepsilon\ ,\ \Lambda_2 > \mathrm{G}\Big\}$$

is all included in the region

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 = \Big\{(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) :\ \Lambda_1 > \mathrm{G} + 2\sqrt{\alpha_+}\Lambda_2\ ,\ \Lambda_2 > \mathrm{G}\Big\}$$

and this allows to conclude

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_2 = \mathcal{L}_2 \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 = \mathcal{L}_2\ .$$

[7] Inequalities $\Lambda_2 < \mathrm{G}_\star$ (which is equivalent to (45)) and $\mathrm{G}_\star < \Lambda_1 - \mathrm{G}$ (which is equivalent to $\mathrm{G}_2 > \mathrm{G}$, in turn implied by the definition of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{SU}}$ above) imply $\Lambda_1 - \Lambda_2 - \mathrm{G} > 0$.



Figure 1: The blue curve is $\mathcal{C}$; the orange line has slope $\underline{k}$, the green one has slope $\overline{k}$ (MATHEMATICA).

Since the sets $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ have a non–empty intersection, independently of α_+ (see Figure 2), a fortiori, $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_2$ have one:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1 \cap \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_2 \supset \mathcal{L}_1 \cap \mathcal{L}_2 \neq \emptyset \ .$$

Observe, in particular, that $\mathcal{L}_1 \cap \mathcal{L}_2$ (hence, $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1 \cap \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_2$) has non–empty intersection with any strip $\mathbb{R} \times \Big[2\mathrm{G}, y\Big]$, with $y > 2\mathrm{G}$ (see Figure 3).

On the other hand, it is immediate to check that $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_3$ includes the horizontal strip

$$\mathcal{L}_3 := \Big\{(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) : \ 2\mathrm{G} < \Lambda_1 < \frac{\mathrm{G}}{2\sqrt{\alpha_+}} \ , \ \Lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}\Big\} \qquad 0 < \alpha_+ < \frac{1}{16}$$

and so we conclude

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathrm{G}) \cap \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathrm{G}) \cap \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{SU}}(\mathrm{G}) = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1 \cap \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_2 \cap \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_3 \supset \mathcal{L}_1 \cap \mathcal{L}_2 \cap \mathcal{L}_3 \neq \emptyset$$

which is what we wanted to prove. ∎



Figure 2: The blue strip corresponds to the set $\mathcal{L}_1$, the green one to $\mathcal{L}_2$ (MATHEMATICA).



Figure 3: $\mathcal{L}_1$: the blue region; $\mathcal{L}_2$: the green region; $\mathcal{L}_3$: the violet region (MATHEMATICA).

A Appendix to Section 2

A.1 The Jacobi–Radau–Deprit coordinates

Let $\mathrm{C}^{(1)}$, $\mathrm{C}^{(2)}$ the angular momenta of the two planets, $\mathrm{C} := \mathrm{C}^{(1)} + \mathrm{C}^{(2)}$ the total angular momentum integral, and assume that the "nodes"

$$\nu_1 := k^{(3)} \times \mathrm{C} \qquad \nu := \mathrm{C} \times \mathrm{C}^{(1)}$$

do not vanish. Given u, v, $w \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with u, $v \perp w$, denote as $\alpha_w(u, v)$ the oriented angle between u and v as sees from w, following the "right hand rule". Then define the JRD–coordinates (6) via the following formulae:

$$\begin{cases} Z := \mathrm{C} \cdot k^{(3)} \\ \mathrm{G} := \|\mathrm{C}\| \\ \mathrm{G}_1 := \|\mathrm{C}^{(1)}\| \\ \mathrm{G}_2 := \|\mathrm{C}^{(2)}\| \\ \Lambda_j := \mathfrak{M}_j \sqrt{\mathfrak{m}_j a_j} \end{cases} \qquad \begin{cases} \zeta := \alpha_{k^{(3)}}(k^{(1)}, \nu_1) \\ \gamma := \alpha_{\mathrm{C}}(\nu_1, \nu) \\ \gamma_1 := \alpha_{\mathrm{C}^{(2)}}(\nu, \mathrm{P}^{(1)}) \\ \gamma_2 := \alpha_{\mathrm{C}^{(2)}}(\nu, \mathrm{P}^{(2)}) \\ \ell_j := \text{ mean anomaly of } x^{(j)} \end{cases}$$

A.2 The outer retrograde configuration: regularization, second–order expansion, full torsion

First of all, observe that the integral G has the expression, in terms of the coordinates (8),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{G} &= \Lambda_1 - \Lambda_2 - \mathrm{i}t_1 t_1^\star - \mathrm{i}t_2 t_2^\star - \mathrm{i}t_3 t_3^\star \\ &= \Lambda_1 - \Lambda_2 - \frac{\eta_1^2 + \xi_1^2}{2} + \frac{\eta_2^2 + \xi_2^2}{2} + \frac{p^2 + q^2}{2} \,. \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

Therefore, as in the case treated in [7], the conservation of G along the $\overline{f_{\mathrm{RPS}^+_\pi}}$–trajectories (which follows from its conservation along the $f_{\mathrm{RPS}^+_\pi}$–trajectories) only monomials

$$c_{a,a^\star}(\Lambda) t_1^{a_1} t_2^{a_2} t_3^{a_3} t_1^{\star a_1^\star} t_2^{\star a_2^\star} t_3^{\star a_3^\star}$$

with a_1, a_2, a_3, $a_1^\star$, $a_2^\star$, $a_3^\star$ verifying

$$a_1 + a_2 + a_3 = a_1^\star + a_2^\star + a_3^\star$$

appear in the expansion of $\overline{f_{\mathrm{RPS}^+_\pi}}$. This immediately implies (11). We now aim to find the second–order expansion of $\overline{f_{\mathrm{RPS}^+_\pi}}$ in terms of the coordinates $(t, t^\star)$ as well as the torsion matrix in the associated Birkhoff normal form. We shall derive such quantities from the corresponding ones for the function f_{RPS}, worked out in [16, 7].

We recall that, in the case $n = 2$, the coordinates RPS, which here we denote as

$$\phi_{\mathrm{RPS}} : \qquad \mathrm{JRD} \to \mathrm{RPS} := (\Lambda, \overline{\lambda}, \overline{\eta}, \overline{p}, \overline{\xi}, \overline{q})$$

are defined via the formulae

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{t}_1 &:= \frac{\overline{\eta}_1 - \mathrm{i}\overline{\xi}_1}{\sqrt{2}} \qquad \overline{t}_2 := \frac{\overline{\eta}_2 - \mathrm{i}\overline{\xi}_2}{\sqrt{2}} \qquad \overline{t}_3 := \frac{\overline{p}_1 - \mathrm{i}\overline{q}_1}{\sqrt{2}} \qquad \overline{T} := \frac{\overline{p}_2 - \mathrm{i}\overline{q}_2}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \overline{t}_1^\star &:= \frac{\overline{\eta}_1 + \mathrm{i}\overline{\xi}_1}{\sqrt{2}\mathrm{i}} \qquad \overline{t}_2^\star := \frac{\overline{\eta}_2 + \mathrm{i}\overline{\xi}_2}{\sqrt{2}\mathrm{i}} \qquad \overline{t}_3^\star := \frac{\overline{p}_1 + \mathrm{i}\overline{q}_1}{\sqrt{2}\mathrm{i}} \qquad \overline{T}^\star := \frac{\overline{p}_2 + \mathrm{i}\overline{q}_2}{\sqrt{2}\mathrm{i}} \,. \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \Lambda_1 = \Lambda_1 \\ \Lambda_2 = \Lambda_2 \\ \overline{t}_1 = \sqrt{\Lambda_1 - \mathrm{G}_1}\, e^{\mathrm{i}(\gamma_1+\gamma+\zeta)} \\ \overline{t}_2 = \sqrt{\Lambda_2 - \mathrm{G}_2}\, e^{\mathrm{i}(\gamma_2+\gamma+\zeta)} \\ \overline{t}_3 = \sqrt{\mathrm{G}_1 + \mathrm{G}_2 - \mathrm{G}}\, e^{\mathrm{i}(\gamma+\zeta)} \end{cases} \qquad \begin{cases} \overline{\lambda}_1 = \ell_1 + \gamma_1 + \gamma + \zeta \\ \overline{\lambda}_2 = \ell_2 + \gamma_2 + \gamma + \zeta \\ \overline{t}_1^\star = -\mathrm{i}\sqrt{\Lambda_1 - \mathrm{G}_1}\, e^{-\mathrm{i}(\gamma_1+\gamma+\zeta)} \\ \overline{t}_2^\star = -\mathrm{i}\sqrt{\Lambda_2 - \mathrm{G}_2}\, e^{-\mathrm{i}(\gamma_2+\gamma+\zeta)} \\ \overline{t}_3^\star = -\mathrm{i}\sqrt{\mathrm{G}_1 + \mathrm{G}_2 - \mathrm{G}}\, e^{-\mathrm{i}(\gamma+\zeta)} \end{cases} \tag{48}$$

while the cyclic couple $(\overline{T}, \overline{T}^\star) = (T, T^\star)$ is the same as in (8).

Denoting $f_{\mathrm{RPS}}(\Lambda, \overline{\lambda}, \overline{t}, \overline{t}^\star)$ and $f_{\mathrm{RPS}^+_\pi}(\Lambda, \lambda, t, t^\star)$ the expressions of f in terms of the coordinates (48), (8), respectively, after some algebra (we omit the details, which consist in using the formulae in [7, Appendix A] and the definitions above), one sees that the following relation holds

$$f_{\mathrm{RPS}^+_\pi}\big(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, t_1, t_2, t_1^\star, t_2^\star\big) = f_{\mathrm{RPS}}\big(\Lambda_1, -\Lambda_2, \lambda_1, -\lambda_2, t_1, t_2, t_1^\star, t_2^\star\big)\ . \tag{49}$$

In particular, the matrix $\sigma(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)$ and the function $\zeta(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)$ in (11) are related to the corresponding quantities in the second–order expansion of

$$\overline{f_{\mathrm{RPS}}} = \overline{C}_0(\Lambda) + \frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}\widehat{\overline{t}}^\star \cdot \overline{\sigma}(\Lambda)\widehat{\overline{t}} + \frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}\overline{t}_3^\star \cdot \overline{\varsigma}(\Lambda)\overline{t}_3 + \mathrm{O}_4(\overline{t}, \overline{t}^\star)\ , \qquad \widehat{\overline{t}} := (\overline{t}_1, \overline{t}_2)\ ,\ \widehat{\overline{t}}^\star := (\overline{t}_1^\star, \overline{t}_2^\star) \tag{50}$$

via the relations

$$\sigma(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) = \overline{\sigma}(\Lambda_1, -\Lambda_2) \qquad \varsigma(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) = \overline{\varsigma}(\Lambda_1, -\Lambda_2)\ . \tag{51}$$

On the other hand, it follows from [7] that

$$\overline{\sigma}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\mathfrak{s}}{\Lambda_1} & \frac{\widetilde{\mathfrak{s}}}{\sqrt{\Lambda_1\Lambda_2}} \\ \frac{\widetilde{\mathfrak{s}}}{\sqrt{\Lambda_1\Lambda_2}} & \frac{\mathfrak{s}}{\Lambda_2} \end{pmatrix} \qquad \overline{\varsigma}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) = -(\frac{1}{\Lambda_1} + \frac{1}{\Lambda_2})\mathfrak{s}\ , \tag{52}$$

with $\mathfrak{s}, \widetilde{\mathfrak{s}}$ as in (13). Therefore, in view of (51) and the fact that $\mathfrak{s}, \widetilde{\mathfrak{s}}$ are even in Λ_2, we have (12). We now turn to to check that the *torsion matrix* T associated to $\overline{f_{\mathrm{RPS}^+_0}}$ in (11) is non–singular. We recall that T is the matrix of the coefficients of the second–order term

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \mathrm{T}_{ij}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)\tau_i\tau_j \tag{53}$$

with

$$\tau_1 = \frac{\eta_1^2 + \xi_1^2}{2} \qquad \tau_2 = \frac{\eta_2^2 + \xi_2^2}{2} \qquad \tau_3 = \frac{p^2 + q^2}{2}$$

of the Birkhoff normal form associated to $\overline{f_{\mathrm{RPS}^+_0}}$.

We also recall that the corresponding torsion matrix $\overline{\mathrm{T}}$ in the second–order term

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \overline{\mathrm{T}}_{ij}\overline{\tau}_i\overline{\tau}_j$$

where

$$\overline{\tau}_1 = \frac{\overline{\eta}_1^2 + \overline{\xi}_1^2}{2} \qquad \overline{\tau}_2 = \frac{\overline{\eta}_2^2 + \overline{\xi}_2^2}{2} \qquad \overline{\tau}_3 = \frac{\overline{p}^2 + \overline{q}^2}{2}$$

associated to $\overline{f_{\text{RPS}}}$ in (50) is given by (compare [7, Equation (8.6)])

$$\overline{\mathrm{T}} = m_1 m_2 \frac{\alpha^2}{a_2} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{3}{4\Lambda_1^2} & -\frac{9}{4\Lambda_1\Lambda_2} & \frac{3}{\Lambda_1^2} \\ -\frac{9}{4\Lambda_1\Lambda_2} & -\frac{3}{\Lambda_2^2} & \frac{9}{4\Lambda_1\Lambda_2} \\ \frac{3}{\Lambda_1^2} & \frac{9}{4\Lambda_1\Lambda_2} & -\frac{3}{4\Lambda_1^2} \end{pmatrix} (1 + \mathrm{O}(a_2^{-5/4}))$$

We observe that

$$\tau_1 = \mathrm{i} t_1 t_1^\star \qquad \tau_2 = -\mathrm{i} t_2 t_2^\star \qquad \tau_3 = -\mathrm{i} t_3 t_3^\star \ , \tag{54}$$

while

$$\overline{\tau}_1 = \mathrm{i}\overline{t}_1 \overline{t}_1^\star \qquad \overline{\tau}_2 = \mathrm{i}\overline{t}_2 \overline{t}_2^\star \qquad \overline{\tau}_3 = \mathrm{i}\overline{t}_3 \overline{t}_3^\star \ . \tag{55}$$

By (49), (54) and (55), the matrix T in (53) is obtained from $\overline{\mathrm{T}}$ changing the signs of the entries $(1,3)$, $(2,3)$, $(3,1)$ and $(3,2)$, while leaving all the other entries unvaried.
Then we find

$$\mathrm{T} = m_1 m_2 \frac{\alpha^2}{a_2} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{3}{4\Lambda_1^2} & -\frac{9}{4\Lambda_1\Lambda_2} & -\frac{3}{\Lambda_1^2} \\ -\frac{9}{4\Lambda_1\Lambda_2} & -\frac{3}{\Lambda_2^2} & -\frac{9}{4\Lambda_1\Lambda_2} \\ -\frac{3}{\Lambda_1^2} & -\frac{9}{4\Lambda_1\Lambda_2} & -\frac{3}{4\Lambda_1^2} \end{pmatrix} (1 + \mathrm{O}(a_2^{-5/4}))$$

We then conclude, as in [7], that, for small $1/a_2$, T is non–singular, since, surprisingly, T has the same determinant as $\overline{\mathrm{T}}$ (compare [7, Equation (8.7)])

$$\det \mathrm{T} = \det \overline{\mathrm{T}} = -\frac{27}{16\Lambda_1^4\Lambda_2^2}\Big(m_1 m_2 \frac{\alpha^2}{a_2}\Big)^3 (1 + \mathrm{O}(a_2^{-5/4})) = -\frac{27}{16}\frac{m_2}{m_1 m_0^3}\frac{a_1^4}{a_2^7}(1 + \mathrm{O}(\mu) + \mathrm{O}(a_2^{-5/4})) \ .$$

B Appendix to Section 3

The maps JRD and P in (6), (16), respectively, are examples of *Kepler maps* (see the Introduction). Kepler maps share a number of properties, which here we recall. For definiteness, we restrict to the case of our interest of $n = 2$ planets. First of all, for all K, the indirect part of the perturbing function does not contribute to the average $\overline{f_{\rm K}}$, and hence one has just to average the Newtonian potential:

$$\overline{f_{\rm K}} = -\frac{m_1 m_2}{(2\pi)^2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2}\frac{d\ell_1 d\ell_2}{\|x_{\rm K}^{(1)} - x_{\rm K}^{(2)}\|}\ .$$

Exploiting the homogeneity of the Newtonian potential, and the fact that $x_{\rm K}^{(i)}$ is proportional to the semi–major axis a_i, it then becomes natural to de–homogenize with respect to a_2 and next to expand such an average

$$\overline{f_{\rm K}} = -\frac{m_1 m_2}{a_2}\Big(\overline{f_{\rm K}}^{(0)} + \overline{f_{\rm K}}^{(1)} + \cdots\Big) \tag{56}$$

where $\overline{f_{\rm K}}^{(j)}$ is proportional to α^j, with the semi–major axes ratio ratio α suitably small.

Due to the fact that, for any Kepler map, the curve $\ell_2 \to x_{\rm K}^{(2)}$ (where ℓ_2 is the mean anomaly of the body 2) is an orbit of the two–body problem, one readily sees that, in this expansion the two former terms are trivial:

$$\overline{f_{\rm K}}^{(0)} = 1 \qquad \overline{f_{\rm K}}^{(1)} \equiv 0\ . \tag{57}$$

Less trivial (see [18, Appendix B]) is to prove that the next (and first meaningful) term is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{f_{\rm K}}^{(2)} &= -\frac{\alpha^2}{8}\frac{\Lambda_2^3}{\Lambda_1^2\|{\rm C}_{\rm K}^{(2)}\|^5}\Big[5(3({\rm P}_{\rm K}^{(1)}\cdot{\rm C}_{\rm K}^{(2)})^2 - \|{\rm C}_{\rm K}^{(2)}\|^2)\Lambda_1^2\\ &- 3(4({\rm P}_{\rm K}^{(1)}\cdot{\rm C}_{\rm K}^{(2)})^2 - \|{\rm C}_{\rm K}^{(2)}\|^2)\|{\rm C}_{\rm K}^{(1)}\|^2 + 3({\rm C}_{\rm K}^{(1)}\times{\rm C}_{\rm K}^{(2)}\cdot{\rm P}_{\rm K}^{(1)})^2\Big]\ .\end{aligned}$$

In the case of K = P, we obtain the expression

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{f_{\rm P}}^{(2)} &= -\frac{\alpha^2}{8}\frac{\Lambda_2^3}{\Lambda_1^2{\rm G}_2^5}\Big[5(3\Theta^2 - {\rm G}_2^2)\Lambda_1^2\\ &- 3(4\Theta^2 - {\rm G}_2^2)\Big({\rm G}^2 + {\rm G}_2^2 - 2\Theta^2 + 2\sqrt{({\rm G}_2^2-\Theta^2)({\rm G}^2-\Theta^2)}\cos\vartheta\Big)\\ &+ 3({\rm G}_2^2-\Theta^2)({\rm G}^2-\Theta^2)\sin^2\vartheta\Big]\ .\end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

Therefore, collecting (56), (57) and (58), one has (24) with

$$\alpha^2({\rm P}_0 + {\rm P}) := \overline{f_{\rm P}}^{(2)}\ , \quad \alpha^3\widehat{\rm P} := \sum_{j=3}^{\infty} f_{\rm P}^{(j)}\ .$$

and, in turn

$$\begin{aligned}{\rm P}_0 &:= -\frac{1}{8}\frac{\Lambda_2^3}{\Lambda_1^2{\rm G}_2^3}\Big(-5\Lambda_1^2 + 3({\rm G}+{\rm G}_2)^2\Big)\\ {\rm P} &:= -\frac{1}{8}\frac{\Lambda_2^3}{\Lambda_1^2{\rm G}_2^5}\Big[15\Lambda_1^2\Theta^2 - 3(4\Theta^2-{\rm G}_2^2)\Big({\rm G}^2+{\rm G}_2^2-2\Theta^2+2\sqrt{({\rm G}_2^2-\Theta^2)({\rm G}^2-\Theta^2)}\cos\vartheta\Big)\\ &- 3{\rm G}_2^2({\rm G}+{\rm G}_2)^2 + 3({\rm G}_2^2-\Theta^2)({\rm G}^2-\Theta^2)\sin^2\vartheta\Big]\ .\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

C Appendix to Section 4

We switch to the homogenized variables

$$x := \frac{\Lambda_2}{\mathrm{G}} \qquad y = \frac{\Lambda_1}{\mathrm{G}}$$

so that the curve $\mathcal{C}$ in (46) becomes

$$\widehat{\mathcal{C}}: \qquad y = (1+x)\sqrt{\frac{4+x}{5}} \ .$$

We look for a straight line through the origin $y = \underline{k}x$ with $\underline{k} > 0$ which is tangent to $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ at some point (a, b), with $a > 0$.

The intersections between $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ and any straight line through the origin $y = kx$ are ruled by a complete cubic equation, given by

$$x^3 + (6 - 5k^2)x^2 + 9x + 4 = 0 \ . \tag{60}$$

In order that such an equation has a double solution $x = a$ for $k = \underline{k}$, one needs that, when $k = \underline{k}$, it can factorized as

$$(x-a)^2(x-c) = 0 \tag{61}$$

Therefore, equating the respective coefficients of (60) and (61) one finds the equations

$$\begin{cases} -(c+2a) = 6 - 5\underline{k}^2 \\ 2ac + a^2 = 9 \\ -a^2 c = 4 \end{cases}$$

Two last equations, allow to eliminate b so as to obtain the equation for a

$$a^3 - 9a - 8 = 0$$

which has the following three roots:

$$a_0 = -1 \ , \qquad a_\pm = \frac{1 \pm \sqrt{33}}{2} \ .$$

The only admissible (positive) value is then

$$a = a_+ = \frac{1+\sqrt{33}}{2}$$

and it provides the values

$$c = \frac{-17+\sqrt{33}}{32} \ , \qquad \underline{k} = \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\frac{3}{10}(69+11\sqrt{33})} \ .$$

References

[1] K. Abdullah and A. Albouy. On a strange resonance noticed by M. Herman. *Regul. Chaotic Dyn.*, 6(4):421–432, 2001.

[2] V. I. Arnol′d. Instability of dynamical systems with many degrees of freedom. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 156:9–12, 1964.

[3] V.I. Arnold. Small denominators and problems of stability of motion in classical and celestial mechanics. *Russian Math. Surveys*, 18(6):85–191, 1963.

[4] L. Biasco, L. Chierchia, and E. Valdinoci. Elliptic two-dimensional invariant tori for the planetary three-body problem. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 170:91–135, 2003. See also: Corrigendum. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*. 180: 507–509, 2006.

[5] L. Chierchia and G. Gallavotti. Drift and diffusion in phase space. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Phys. Théor.*, 60(1):144, 1994.

[6] L. Chierchia and G. Pinzari. Properly–degenerate KAM theory (following V.I. Arnold). *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S*, 3(4):545–578, 2010.

[7] L. Chierchia and G. Pinzari. The planetary N-body problem: symplectic foliation, reductions and invariant tori. *Invent. Math.*, 186(1):1–77, 2011.

[8] L. Chierchia and G. Pinzari. Metric stability of the planetary n–body problem. *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians*, 2014.

[9] A. Deprit. Elimination of the nodes in problems of n bodies. *Celestial Mech.*, 30(2):181–195, 1983.

[10] J. Féjoz. Démonstration du 'théorème d'Arnold' sur la stabilité du système planétaire (d'après Herman). *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 24(5):1521–1582, 2004.

[11] J. Féjoz. On "Arnold's theorem" in celestial mechanics –a summary with an appendix on the poincaré coordinates. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems*, 33:3555–3565, 2013.

[12] M. R. Herman. Torsion du problème planétaire, edited by J. Féjoz in 2009. Available in the electronic 'Archives Michel Herman' at http://www.college-de-france.fr/default/EN/all/equ_dif/archives_michel_herman.htm.

[13] C. G. J. Jacobi. Sur l'élimination des noeuds dans le problème des trois corps. *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Bd XX:81–102, 1842.

[14] J. Laskar and P. Robutel. Stability of the planetary three-body problem. I. Expansion of the planetary Hamiltonian. *Celestial Mech. Dynam. Astronom.*, 62(3):193–217, 1995.

[15] J. Moser. The analytic invariants of an area-preserving mapping near a hyperbolic fixed point. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 9:673–692, 1956.

[16] G. Pinzari. *On the Kolmogorov set for many–body problems.* PhD thesis, Università Roma Tre, April 2009.

[17] G. Pinzari. Aspects of the planetary Birkhoff normal form. *Regul. Chaotic Dyn.*, 18(6):860–906, 2013.

[18] G. Pinzari. A first integral to the partially averaged Newtonian potential of the three–body problem. 2016. arXiv: 1607.03056.

[19] G. Pinzari. Perihelia reduction and global Kolmogorov tori in the planetary problem. *Memoirs American Mathematical Society*, to appear. preprint 2015. arXiv: 1501.04470.

[20] J. Pöschel. Nekhoroshev estimates for quasi-convex Hamiltonian systems. *Math. Z.*, 213(2):187–216, 1993.

[21] R. Radau. Sur une transformation des équations différentielles de la dynamique. *Ann. Sci. Ec. Norm. Sup.*, 5:311–375, 1868.

[22] P. Robutel. Stability of the planetary three-body problem. II. KAM theory and existence of quasiperiodic motions. *Celestial Mech. Dynam. Astronom.*, 62(3):219–261, 1995.

[23] E. Valdinoci. Families of whiskered tori for a-priori stable/unstable Hamiltonian systems and construction of unstable orbits. *Math. Phys. Electron. J.*, 6:Paper 2, 31 pp. (electronic), 2000.